

REMARKS

Amendments

5

Claim 1 has been amended to make it clearer that the claimed method does not require a broker, that the metadata is received on the client and that the proxies are generated at the client. Language deleted from claim 1 has
10 been added to claim 8.

Claim 9 has been amended to make it clearer that the claimed system does not require a broker, and to simplify and clarify language.

15

Claim 10 has been amended to address the Examiner's objection for lack of antecedent basis.

Claim 12 has been added to recite a computer readable
20 medium carrying instructions for carrying out the method of claim 1. Claim 12 recites all of the essential elements of claim 1. New claims 13-18 generally recite the elements of claims 2-8, in the context of a computer readable medium. Accordingly, it is believed that all of the new claims are
25 fully supported by the application as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Prior Art Rejections

30 The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 for anticipation based on Thomas.

In Thomas, clients and internet services are matched by a broker, (see Abstract, Field and paragraph 11 of Thomas). All embodiments of Thomas involve the use of a broker, and
5 clients request and download proxies from the broker, (see paragraphs 15, 18, 21, 22 and 24 of Thomas). The advantage of using a broker is that many types of objects can be exposed via the broker. However, the disadvantage is that if the broker fails, all connections are lost.

10

In contrast, no broker is used in the present invention. The present invention is directly object-to-object with no intermediary. The advantage of the present invention is that the overall system still runs even if a few clients
15 fail.

15

In the present invention the proxy is generated by the client. This is a critical difference between the present invention and Thomas, which claims that "the client is
20 relieved from having to develop a remote communications code" (see Abstract and paragraph 11 of Thomas).

20

Another significant difference between the two inventions lies in the concept of dynamic vs. static proxies. The
25 present invention generates proxies "statically" based on class definitions at compile time. It assumes that the objects will not change their signatures. In the system of Thomas the client "dynamically" retrieves a proxy from the broker and then connects to an internet service:

25

30

In an embodiment, the client downloads the requested communication proxy and dynamically interacts, at runtime, with an Internet service using the requested communication proxy, the communication proxy being local to the client. In an embodiment of the invention, a client application is executing, and during runtime the client is interacting with the communications proxy. By "dynamically interact" it is meant, in an embodiment of the invention, that the client has no prior knowledge of what is needed to interact with an Internet service. In an embodiment of the invention, the client is relieved from having to develop a remote communications code (see paragraph 11 of Thomas, emphasis added).

A key aspect of Thomas is "that the client has no prior knowledge of what is needed to interact with an Internet service."

In contrast, the present invention involves the direct one-to-one mapping, of .Net classes and Java classes. The mapping between classes is determined in advance, at compile time. Such mapping of classes is not discussed or suggested by Thomas. To Applicant's knowledge such one-to-one mapping has not been done before.

The one-to-one mapping of the present invention is intended to provide a "mirror" environment for developers, making java look like .NET and .NET look like java. The invention of Thomas is far more generic and doesn't concern itself with "mimicking" another system.

Zhang similarly requires a broker (see, for example, the Abstract of Zhang).

Each of the independent claims of the present application
5 recite brokerless means for the generation of proxies using
one-to-one mapping of classes between two languages.
Applicant submits that this is neither anticipated nor
rendered obvious by Thomas or Zhang.

10 Applicant submits that the present response places the
application in condition for allowance.

A check in the amount of \$225.00 is attached herewith
for the Two Month Extension of Time. It is believed no
15 other fee is due with this submission. Should that
determination be incorrect, then please debit Deposit
Account No. 50-0644 and notify the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

20

Dated: 2-28-2006

By: 

Matthew A. Pequignot
Reg. No. 43,851
Attorney for Applicant

25

Hall, Vande Sande & Pequignot, LLP
10220 River Road, Suite 200
Potomac, Maryland
30 USA 20854
Tel: (301) 983 - 2500
Fax: (301) 983 - 2100